

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DONALD ANGELO VICARI,

Plaintiff,

v.

AMADOR COUNTY,

Defendant.

No. 2:22-cv-0215 AC P

ORDER

Plaintiff has filed a motion requesting that the court “postpone consideration of defendant’s motion/response.” ECF No. 18. It appears that plaintiff is requesting additional time to respond to defendant’s answer to the complaint, which he states he has yet to receive a copy of and became aware of through the discovery and scheduling order. Id.

The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure do not provide for a reply to an answer absent an order from the court. Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(a)(1)(c). The court has not ordered a reply to the answer and plaintiff has not identified any grounds warranting a reply. The request for an extension of time to reply to the answer will therefore be denied. Since it appears that plaintiff has not yet received a copy of defendant’s answer, defendant will be directed to re-serve plaintiff with its answer.

////


////

1 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

2 1. Plaintiff's request for an extension of time to reply to defendant's answer (ECF No.  
3 18) is DENIED; and

4 2. Within seven days of the filing of this order, defendant shall re-serve plaintiff with a  
5 copy of its answer, if it has not done so already.

6 DATED: May 23, 2023

7   
8 ALLISON CLAIRE  
9 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28